

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-12 are pending in the application, with Claims 1 and 8 being independent claims.

Claims 1, 3-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goyal et al. (U.S. Pat. No.6,751,473) in view of Borngräber et al. (U.S. Pat. No.7,215,881).

Claims 2 and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Goyal et al. in view of Borngräber et al. and further in view of Park (U.S. Pat. No.6,704,586).

Claims 1-2, 4, 8-9 and 11 are amended. Claim 12 is new. No new subject matter is presented.

Claims 1 and 8 are amended. No new subject matter is presented.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner states that Goyal et al. in view of Borngräber et al. renders the claim obvious. Amended Claim 1 teaches, in part, a portable wireless terminal comprising a first housing; and a camera lens unit mounted in the first housing, the camera lens unit having an exposure window and a camera lens, *both the exposure window and the camera lens circumferentially movable in the first housing*.

Goyal et al. discloses a portable wireless terminal comprising a first housing 2 and a camera lens unit 6 mounted in the first housing 2, the camera lens unit 6 having an exposure window 5 and a camera lens 6 (col. 3 lines 35-41, FIGs. 1-6). Both the exposure window 5 and the camera lens 6 of Goyal et al. are stationary with respect to the first housing 2 (FIGs. 1-6). Goyal et al. fails to disclose the limitation of *both the exposure window and the camera lens circumferentially movable in the first housing* taught by Amended Claim 1.

Borngräber et al. discloses a portable wireless terminal 10 comprising a first housing 10; and a camera lens unit 25 mounted in the first housing 10, the camera lens unit 25 having an exposure window 37, a camera lens 31, and a correction lens 34 (FIGs. 1-3). With respect to the first housing 10 of Borngräber et al., the correction lens 34 is movable, but both the exposure window 37 and the

camera lens 31 are stationary (col. 6 lines 5-11, FIGs. 1-3). Borngräber et al. fails to disclose the limitation of *both the exposure window and the camera lens circumferentially movable in the first housing* taught by Amended Claim 1, and thus fails to cure the defects of Goyal et al.

Clearly, Amended Claim 1 structurally differs from Goyal et al., Borngräber et al., or the combination thereof.

Regarding the rejection of Claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the above rationale for Amended Claim 1 also similarly applies to Amended Claim 8 with respect to Goyal et al., Borngräber et al., or the combination thereof.

Accordingly, all of the claims pending in the application, namely Claims 1-12, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference or personal interview would facilitate resolution of any remaining matters, the Examiner may contact Applicant's attorney at the number given below.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul J. Farrell  
Reg. No. 33,494  
Attorney for Applicants

The Farrell Law Firm  
333 Earle Ovington Boulevard, Suite 701  
Uniondale, New York 11553

Tel 516-228-3565  
Fax 516-228-8475

PJF/DGL/mk